

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants thank the Examiner for the interview that took place on April 17, 2006 between the Examiner and Applicants' representative. During the interview, the Examiner indicated that the claims were allowable, but requested removal of "and/or" language in claims 1 and 17, and "one or more" language in claims 33, 36, 39, and 42. Applicants' representative agreed to this amendment.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the interview that took place on April 21, 2006 between the Examiner and Applicants' representative. During the interview, the reasons for allowance were discussed. The Examiner noted that the Hines reference had not been cited in prior actions. In addition, the Examiner explained that the Weiderin reference described a general concept that was too broad to combine with the other references.

REMARKS

Claims 1-13, 15-29, and 31-51 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In an Official Action dated April 20, 2006, claims 1 and 17 were rejected. Claims 1-13, 15-29, and 31-52 were allowed.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC § 112, Paragraph 2

In the second paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 17 as allegedly not specifically pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter that the Applicants regard as the invention due to the use of "and/or" in the claim.

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 17 to remove "and/or" from the claims. In addition, applicants have amended claims 33, 36, 39, and 42 to remove "one or more" as

discussed in the Examiner's Interview, as well as minor linguistic and antecedent basis corrections to other claims.

This amendment of the claims is made so as to more clearly define the invention, and not to narrow their scope of protection with respect to the prior art, or with respect to potentially infringing devices/compositions/articles.

Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance

In the fifth paragraph, the Examiner has indicated that claims 1-13, 15-29, and 31-51 are allowed. Applicants thank the Examiner for allowing the claims, and for the above-referenced interviews. With respect to the Examiner's comments during the April 21, 2006 interview regarding the Weiderin reference and removal of all substantive rejections of the pending claims, that none of the references, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least the real-time tracking of goods in a supply chain, including charging users of said supply chain a fee dependent on the number of tracked goods or on the number of transactions including a read of a tag on a good.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-13, 15-29, and 31-51, as presented herein, are now in condition for allowance, as indicated by the Examiner.

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
Xi Li, Keng-Shao Chang, John J. Dooley,
Abhijit A. Deshpande, Thomas Alan Greene, and
Darren Jeffrey Hakeman

Date: April 24, 2006 By:


Jennifer R. Bush, Reg. No. 50,784
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7213
Fax: (650) 938-5200